

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
DELTA DIVISION**

**JACOB BAKER
#005349**

PLAINTIFF

V. CASE NO. 2:20-CV-75-LPR-BD

PATRICIA SNYDER, *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION

I. Procedures for Filing Objections

This Recommendation for dismissal has been sent to Judge Lee P. Rudofsky. Mr. Baker may file objections with the Clerk of Court if he disagrees with the findings or conclusions set out in the Recommendation. Objections should be specific and should include the factual or legal basis for the objection.

To be considered, objections must be filed with the Clerk of Court within 14 days. If Mr. Baker does not file objections, he risks waiving the right to appeal questions of fact. And, if no objections are filed, Judge Rudofsky can adopt this Recommendation without independently reviewing the record.

II. Discussion

Plaintiff Jacob Baker, along with another inmate in the Arkansas County Detention Center, filed this lawsuit on April 6, 2020, claiming that Detention Center officials failed to provide them with constitutionally adequate medical care. (Doc. No. 1) Mr. Baker did not file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) or pay the filing fee at the time the complaint was filed. The Court, therefore, ordered Mr. Baker to

address the filing fee requirement within 30 days of April 8 by either paying the fee or filing an IFP application or risk dismissal of his claims. (Doc. No. 2) That Order was returned to the Court as undeliverable on April 16. (Doc. No. 3) On April 20, the Court ordered Mr. Baker to file a notice of his current address within 30 days. (Doc. No. 4)

The Court requires plaintiffs who are not represented by counsel to keep the Court informed as to their current addresses. Local Rule 5.5 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. Mr. Baker has not provided the Court with his current address, as ordered; in fact, he has not communicated with the Court at all since filing his complaint on April 6, 2020. The Court specifically cautioned Mr. Baker twice that his claims could be dismissed if he failed to comply with the Court's orders. (Doc. No. 2, Doc. No. 4)

III. Conclusion

The Court recommends that Mr. Baker's claims be DISMISSED, without prejudice, based on his failure to comply with the Court's April 8 and 20, 2020 Orders and his failure to prosecute this case.

DATED this 22nd day of May, 2020.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE